

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-7 and 9-32 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 and 9-19, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,890,166 to Eisenberg et al. (hereinafter "Eisenberg") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,678 to Bendert et al. (hereinafter "Bendert"). The Examiner has rejected claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg in view of Bendert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,492 to Bereiter et al. (hereinafter "Bereiter").

Claims 28-30

The "Disposition of Claims" section of the Office Action Summary, the "Status of Claims" on page 2 of the office action, and the sentence immediately preceding paragraph 1 of the office action summary all include claim 28 in the range of claims described as being rejected. However, there is no description in the office action of any prior art which teaches or suggests the claimed subject matter of claim 28, including the limitation that the previous version of the project data comprises a value for a project data attribute and comprises user interface information. Applicants submit that the subject matter of claim 28 is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art, and that, therefore, claim 28 and its dependent claims 29 and 30 are patentable.

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 25-27

With respect to claims 1, 9, 25, and 26 and their dependent claims 2-7, 10-15, and 27, the Examiner has noted that Eisenberg does not clearly teach the step of saving a previous version of the project data containing a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update. However, applicants submit that this step is also not present in Bendert.

Bendert describes a system in which an update to a data object is made by having a clone storage area (e.g. 100' in Bendert Figure 2(c)) with information regarding the original object portion (D2 in Bendert Figure 2(c)) while the base storage area (100 in Bendert Figure 2(c)) contains information regarding the updated object portion. However, the Examiner has

found the clone count in Bendert to corresponds to the “value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update” which is contained in the previous version of project data in the claimed invention. However, in Bendert, the clone count is metadata about the object portions (see Bendert at column 6, line 61, through column 7, line 5) and is contained in the metadata portions (102, 103, 104, 102’ in Bendert) of the base storage area and clone storage areas, and not in the object portions (D1, D2, etc. in Bendert). Thus the clone count does not correspond to the project data attribute, and the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by Eisenberg and Bendert.

Claims 16-18 and 31-32

With respect to claim 16 and claim 31, and to their dependent claims 17, 18 and 32, the Examiner states that the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert teaches the claimed limitations, including the limitation of a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of project data comprising at least one project data element. While the Examiner refers to column 18, lines 10-20 of Eisenberg as teaching this limitation, neither this section of Eisenberg, which describes a derivation graph for a versioned-data management system, nor any other teaching or suggestion in Eisenberg or Bendert teaches the limitation.

With respect to claim 17 and claim 32, these claims include the limitation of “a visual interface operative to ... receive an update to the project data element” and “a project database operative to store a new version of project data upon receipt of an update to the project data element.” Neither Eisenberg nor Bendert teaches such a visual interface. While Eisenberg generally describes a versioned data management system which a user accesses directly or through a “Tool 108,” it does not describe such accesses or describe or define the “Tool 108.” Thus, the claimed limitations are not taught nor suggested by Eisenberg or Bendert.

In addition, the Examiner points to no teaching in either Eisenberg nor Bendert to teach “a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of project data, each of said versions comprising ... user interface information corresponding to a user interface used to display said at least one project data element” as in claim 31 and its dependent claim 32. These limitations are neither taught nor suggested in the prior art.

Claims 19-24

With respect to claim 19 and to its dependent claims 20-24, the Examiner states that the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert teaches the claimed limitations. For the limitation of “determining a selected version of the project data” the examiner refers to Bendert, column 4, lines 62-67. This section describes the Copied PBNs table, which is “[a] list of storage block identifiers (PBNs) that identify blocks of data in objects in the base storage area that were changed after the base storage area was cloned.” For the limitation of “reading a selected property value for the selected version,” the examiner refers to Bendert, column 4, lines 52-56. This section describes elements of object metadata. However, object metadata is not part of the blocks of data in objects in the base storage area, so reading such object metadata does not teach or suggest reading a block of data in an object in Bendert. Thus no selection of a version of a data block and then reading of a property value from the data block is taught in the specified text in Bendert.

Additionally, “reading a second property value for at least one other version of project data” is not taught or suggested in Column 5, lines 1-6 of Bendert, which does not refer to different versions of the same data block (in Bendert). Because no reading of a selected property value and a second property value is found in Bendert or in Eisenberg, the prior art does not show or teach the claim limitations.

Additionally, while column 7, lines 1-4 does describe a comparison, the comparison is of an element of metadata, not of values of data stored in versions of blocks of data, so the correspondence is inapposite.

The claimed limitation of “highlighting the selected property value” “if the selected property value and the second property value” is not found by the examiner anywhere in Bendert or in Eisenberg.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0558/140709.1
Application No.: 09/717,645
Office Action Dated: November 16, 2004

PATENT

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance based on, inter alia, arguments patentably distinguishing them over the cited art. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested

Date: February 16, 2005



Christos A. Ioannidi
Registration No. 54,195
for Sharon Fenick
Registration No. 45,269

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439